REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 9, 2009. An RCE is being filed along with this amendment. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, and 26-37 were pending in that action and all claims were rejected. With the present response, claims 1, 4, 12, 15, and 26-28 are amended, claims 3, 5-10, and 13-14 are cancelled, and the remaining claims are unchanged. Consideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully solicited in light of the following comments.

35 USC §102 and §103 Rejections

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15 and 26 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Craig Utley, "A Programmer's Introduction to Visual Basic .NET," SAMS Publishing, 2001. On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 12, and 27-37 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Utley in view of Griffiths et al. ".NET Windows forms in a Nutshell," April 2003. For at least the reasons discussed below, Applicant respectfully contends that the claims are patentable over the cited references considered individually or in combination. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow the claims.

Claims 1, 4, 12, 15, and 26-28:

Claims 1, 4, 12, 15, and 26-28 have been amended such that they recite new limitations and new combinations of limitations that have not been previously considered by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully contends that at least as amended that the claims are not anticipated by or obvious in view of the cited references. Applicant therefore respectfully contends that the claims are patentable.

The amendments are well supported throughout the application as originally filed. Exemplary support for the claims is listed below.

Claim 1 has been amended to include several new limitations. The claim 1 amendment of "a graphical user interface" is supported for example by FIG. 1, element 160 and FIGS. 3-4. The claim 1 amendment of "the graphical user interface having a coding area, a tab, a file selection area, and a configuration area" is supported for example by FIG. 3, elements 302, 304, 305, and 306. The claim 1 amendment of "the coding area receiving code input from the developer" is supported for example on page

14, lines 1-2 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "the tab indicating a designation of a file that the developer is authoring" is supported for example on page 14, lines 2-5 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "the file selection area enabling the developer to move between different files and projects" is supported for example on page 14, lines 6-8 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "the configuration area enabling the developer to selectively activate or deactivate various programming tools, one of the various programming tools being a StringRes tool" is supported for example on page 14, lines 8-11 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "receiving from the developer a precursor to the resource identifier in the coding area" is supported for example on page 17, lines 23-26 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "following the receipt of the precursor, receiving an activation key from the developer in the coding area" is supported for example by FIG. 4, element 425 and on page 17, lines 26-27 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "initiating, based at least in part on receipt of the activation key and the precursor, a response from the StringRes tool, the response including a drop-down menu that is located proximate the precursor in the coding area" is supported for example by FIG. 4, element 430 and on page 17, line 26 to page 18, line 2 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "the drop-down menu containing resource information that is valid for the precursor" is supported for example on page 18 lines 1-2 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "the information arranged in a hierarchical fashion, the information including key names that correspond to elements" is supported for example on page 18, lines 3-17 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "the developer navigating the drop-down menu and pausing on one of the key names" is supported for example on page 18, lines 18-21 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "initiating, based at least in part on the pause, an appearance of a corresponding pop-up box, the pop-up box located proximate the drop-down menu in the coding area, the drop-down menu being located between the precursor and the pop-up box" is supported for example by FIG. 4, element 436 and on page 18, lines 20-24 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "the drop-down menu including string and value information related to the one of the key names" is supported for example by FIG. 4, element 436 and on page 18, lines 20-24 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "receiving a selection from the developer of

a second one of the key names" is supported for example on page 18, lines 24-28 of the specification. The claim 1 amendment of "the one of the plurality of manage code resources corresponding to the second one of the key names, the programming code located in the coding area" is supported for example on page 18, lines 14-17 and 24-28 of the specification.

The claim 12 amendment is supported for example on page 20, line 7 to page 21, line 8 of the specification.

Claim 15 has also been amended to include several new limitations. The claim 15 amendment of "the managed code execution environment including a design program, a managed code infrastructure, and a resource manager, the design program having tools for designing, building, testing, and deploying applications, the managed code infrastructure supporting cross-language compliant code, the design program cooperating with the managed code infrastructure in production of code that is compliant with a common language specification" is supported for example by FIG. 2 and on page 11, lines 1-28 of the specification. The claim 15 amendment of "the common language specification comprising a set of basic language features that are common across multiple applications, the set of basic features being exposed in application programming interfaces to other code" is supported for example on page 2, lines 2-17 of the specification. The claim 15 amendment of "the resource manager managing resource information for languages supported by the managed code infrastructure" is supported for example on page 12, lines 1-14 of the specification. The claim 15 amendment of "the resource information including information pertaining to resources that are compliant with the common language specification" is supported for example on page 12, lines 1-14 of the specification.

The claim 26 amendment is supported for example on page 12, lines 19-30 of the specification. The claim 27 amendment is supported for example on page 16, lines 15-26 of the specification. The claim 28 amendment is supported for example on page 19, lines 12-28 of the specification.

Claims 29-37:

In rejecting claims 29-37 on page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner simply stated that "[r]egarding the recitations in claims 29-37, See rationales addressed in the

rejection of claims 1, 3-10, 12-14, accordingly." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection.

Claims 29-37 include limitations and combinations of limitations not included in the previously presented claims 1, 3-10, and 12-14. Applicant clearly pointed this out in his March 24, 2009 Amendment. For example, page 13 of that Amendment states that claim 29 "includes several new limitations that have not been previously presented in any of the claims. For example, claim 29 recites communicating a resource request to a resource manager. Claim 29 also recites displaying a collection of identifiers that each correspond to the key name and the string."

Due to differences between claims 29-37 and claims 1, 3-10, and 12-14 (such as the differences highlighted in the language quoted above), Applicant respectfully contends that he has not been given a fair opportunity to respond to the rejection. Applicant is not sure what sections of the references that the Examiner is contending disclose the claim limitations. Applicant is in fact not even sure which one of the two cited references the Examiner contends discloses the claim limitations.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully contends that the Examiner's rejection of the claims is improper. The Examiner has failed to establish that all elements of the claims are either disclosed by or obvious in view of the cited references. Additionally, Applicant has reviewed the cited references and does not believe that the claims are anticipated or obvious in view of those references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Finally, in the event that the Examiner continues to reject the claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner clearly communicate his basis of rejection. As is stated in MPEP 706.02(j) "[i]t is important for an examiner to properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply." That section of the MPEP also states that the Examiner should provide the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s).

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, 12, 15, and 26-37 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references. Accordingly, consideration and allowance of

claims 1, 4, 12, 15, and 26-37 are respectfully solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully Submitted,

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

By: /christopher l holt/
Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052-6399
Phone: (425) 707-9382

CLH: rkm